

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 19 2006

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are a supplemental reply to the Office Action mailed April 19, 2006, an Examiner Interview conducted on September 11, 2006, and Examiner's Interview Summary mailed on September 19, 2006. Applicant submits that the Examiner's Interview Summary is correct and complete as to the substance and outcome of the interview.

Applicant acknowledges with thanks Examiner Pich's assistance in granting an interview on September 11, 2006, during the course of which interview various features of the claimed embodiments were discussed, the substance of which is fully included herein.

Claims 1-41 were pending in the Application prior to the Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-41. The Supplemental Reply amends claims 1, 2, 18, and 19, and cancels claims 3, 14, 20, 31, and 41, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-19, 21-30, and 32-40. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Claims 1-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-17 and 40-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-2, 5-19, and 22-41 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiederhold (U.S. 6,226,745) in view of Devine et al. (U.S. 6,606,708) and further in view of Blewett (U.S. 5,551,040).

- 12 -

Attorney Docket No.: BEAS-01084US0  
tplunkett/beas/1084us0/1084us0.supplemental.reply.doc

Claims 3-4 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiederhold in view of Devine et al. and Blewett and further in view of javaworld.com.

## II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

A Reply to the Office Action was filed on August 23, 2006. The present reply is a supplement to the reply filed on August 23, 2006, and is also in response to an examiner interview on September 11, 2006. The present response amends Claims 1, 2, 18, and 19 to more clearly define Application Container and Context Information within the embodiment of the invention. Reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

## III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define Application Container and Context Information within the embodiment of the invention. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. (Currently Amended): A security system for allowing a client to access a protected resource through an application container, the security system comprising:

an application container, which provides services for a protected resource, wherein the application container delegates authorization decisions to the security service by passing an access request and a callback handler to the security service when the application container receives an access request for a protected resource from a client;

context information, wherein the context information comprises one or more parameter values describing the access request and can be retrieved from the application container by the security service using the callback handler;

~~an application interface mechanism for receiving an access request from a client to access said protected resource, and communicating the access request to the application container, and the application container calls the security service with the access request and a callback handler;~~

said security service for making a decision to permit or deny the access request, wherein the security service includes a plurality of security providers that may be plugged into the security service, and

wherein the plurality of security providers use the callback handler to request context information from the application container for the access request, and wherein depending on output from each security provider the security service determines entitlements for the client to use with the protected resource; said security service is located at a first computer, and said protected resource is located either at the same first computer or at a second computer; and a resource interface for communicating permitted access requests to said protected resource.

Claim 1 claims a security system. When a client attempts to access a protected resource, the access request is received by the application container. The application container provides access to services for the resources it protects, one of those services being a security service. The authorization decision is delegated from the application container to the security service by passing the access request along with a callback handler to the security service. If the security service needs more information from the application container to make a decision, the security service can use the callback handler to request context information from the Application container. Furthermore, the security service has a pluggable architecture for allowing security and business logic plug-ins to influence access decisions for protected resources which allows a plurality of security providers to request context information regarding access requests if necessary.

Wiederhold's security system involved a human security officer and was meant to modify a Relational Database Management System, not the Application Container of claim 1. Devine describes the use of web servers, but not the Application Container of claim 1. Blewett describes callbacks, but not callbacks to obtain context information. Applicant submits that neither application containers nor context information as described in claim 1 are disclosed in the references cited by the office action.

For the reasons stated above as well as the reasoning discussed in the August 23, 2006 reply and the September 11, 2006 Examiner Interview, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment as defined in Claim 1 is patentable. Dependent claims 2, 4-13, 15-17, 40 depend from claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above, with regards to claim 1, claims 2, 4-13, 15-17, 40 are also patentable. It is also submitted that claims 2, 4-13, 15-17, 40 also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future. Independent claim 18 and its dependent claims 19-34 are believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with regards to claims 1-17, 40-41. Independent claim 35 and its dependent claims 36-39 are believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with regards to claims 1-17, 40-41.

#### Conclusion


In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, October 19, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 19, 2006

By: 

Thomas K. Plunkett  
Reg. No. 57,253

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Customer No. 23910